

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of the rejections and further examination are requested.

I. Amendments to the Claims

Claim 7 has been newly cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein. Claims 2, 6 and 12 also remain cancelled.

Further, claims 1, 11, 14 and 15 have been amended to clarify features of the invention recited therein and to further distinguish the present invention from the references relied upon in the rejections discussed below.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

Claims 1, 3-5, 7-11 and 13-15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over various combinations of Knee et al. (U.S. 6,769,128), Hendricks et al. (U.S. 7,134,131), and Krzyzanowski et al. (U.S. 2006/0053447). These rejections are believed clearly inapplicable to amended independent claims 1, 11, 14 and 15 for the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites a remote control apparatus that includes, in part, an operation receiving unit, having (1) an operational button for receiving a user operation from a user, the operational button regarding a detection of the user pushing the operational button as a first user operation and regarding a detection of the operation button becoming released after the detection of the user pushing the operational button as a second user operation. In addition, claim 1 recites that, (2) when the first user operation has been received, a requesting unit requests a piece of

reception information from a program selecting apparatus, and recites that a receiving unit receives and records the requested piece of information onto a recording medium. Claim 1 also recites an informing unit that, (3) when the piece of reception information is recorded onto the recording medium, informs the user that the operation button is allowed to be released. Finally, claim 1 recites (4) that a forwarding unit forwards the piece of recorded reception information after the second user operation has been received. Knee, Hendricks, and Krzyzanowski, or any combination thereof fails to disclose or suggest above-mentioned distinguishing features (1)-(4) as recited in independent claim 1.

Initially, please note that the above-described 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection acknowledges that Knee and Hendricks fail to disclose or suggest the use of the operation button, as recited in amended claim 1. In light of the above, this rejection relies on Krzyzanowski for teaching the above-mentioned features which are admittedly lacking from Knee and Hendricks.

However, Krzyzanowski merely teaches that a user can associate a “watch movie” macro with a specific button or icon, wherein, when the user activates the “watch movie” macro, associated commands for implementing the user’s pre-specified selections are recalled and executed (see paragraph [0201]).

Thus, in view of the above, it is clear that Krzyzanowski teaches that a user activates a button/icon to execute various commands, but fails to disclose or suggest an operational button for receiving a user operation from a user, the operational button that regarding a detection of the user pushing the operational button as a first user operation and regarding a detection of the operation button becoming released after the detection of the user pushing the operational button as a second user operation, as required by claim 1.

In other words, although Krzyzanowski teaches that a button is activated (i.e., selected/pressed) to execute a command, Krzyzanowski still fails to disclose or suggest a single operation button that regards a pushing of the button as a first operation and that regards a releasing of the button (after the first operation) as a second user operation, as recited in claim 1.

Furthermore, it is also apparent that Krzyzanowski teaches that the single act of activating/pushing/selecting the macro button executes a series of commands, but fails to disclose or suggest that (i) when the first operation has been received (the button has been pushed), a requesting unit requests a piece of reception information from a program selecting apparatus, (ii) a receiving unit receives and records the requested piece of information onto a recording medium, (iii) when the piece of reception information is recorded onto the recording medium, an informing unit informs the user that the operation button is allowed to be released (i.e., the second operation), and (iv) a forwarding unit forwards the piece of recorded reception information after the second user operation has been received (i.e., the button has been released), as required by claim 1.

Therefore, because of the above-mentioned distinctions it is believed clear that claim 1 and claims 3-5 and 8-10 that depend therefrom would not have been obvious or result from any combination of Knee, Hendricks and Krzyzanowski.

In addition, Applicants also note that Hendricks describes a broadcast digital television environment 131 including a network controller 214, as the controller of a local cable system 114, which provides digital broadcast programming to subscribers. The network controller 214 receives programming 115 from a broadcast affiliate 112 or directly from a national broadcaster 110. Programming 197, provided by controller 214, may include a local authorization code 197'

to subscribers of the local cable system 114. The authorization code 197' is provided in response to an order placed by a subscriber, and is formatted such that it can be interpreted only by the terminal to which it is addressed. A set top terminal 220 receives the programming 197 and may provide programs for display on a television 170 (see col. 24, lines 36-60).

Thus, Hendricks does not describe a remote control apparatus that contains a receiving unit for recording on a recording medium, included in the remote control apparatus, information transmitted from a program selecting apparatus. Moreover, Hendricks does not describe a remote control apparatus including informing unit that informs the user that the operation button is allowed to be released and a forwarding unit that forwards the piece of recorded reception information after the second user operation has been received, as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, for these additional reasons it is also submitted that claim 1 and claims 3-5 and 8-10 that depend therefrom would not have been obvious or result from any combination of Knee, Hendricks and Krzyzanowski.

Furthermore, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Knee, Hendricks and Krzyzanowski or elsewhere in the prior art of record which would have caused a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Knee, Hendricks and Krzyzanowski to obtain the invention of independent claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 and claims 3-5 and 8-10 that depend therefrom are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

Amended independent claims 11, 14 and 15 are directed to a system, a method, and a program, respectively and each recite features that correspond to the above-mentioned distinguishing features of independent claim 1. Thus, for the same reasons discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 11, 14 and 15 and claim 13 that depends

therefrom are allowable over the prior art of record.

III. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance and an early notification thereof is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Tetsuji FUCHIKAMI et al.

/Andrew L. Dunlap/

By: 2008.12.15 16:23:47 -05'00'

Andrew L. Dunlap

Registration No. 60,554

Attorney for Applicants

ALD/led
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
December 15, 2008